UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/765,720	10/765,720 01/26/2004 Gilad Odinak		INTL-1-1039	2555
	7590 09/01/201 E <b>&amp; GRAHAM, PLLC</b>	EXAMINER		
701 FIFTH AV		ZEWARI, SAYED T		
SUITE 4800 SEATTLE, WA 98104			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/01/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing-patent@blacklaw.com blgdocketing@blacklaw.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/765,720	ODINAK, GILAD		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SAYED T. ZEWARI	2617		

		OMIED 1: ZEVMAN	2017	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE F	REPLY FILED <u>09 August 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
á á f	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coeriods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places th with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request	е
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	-		
b) [	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.	
have bounder 3 set fort may re	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date seen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exist CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later duce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). CE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) a	as
	 Гhe Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of	f
f I	iling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w DMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since	
(	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to a) They raise new issues that would require further contains the contains a second require further contains a second	nsideration and/or search (see NO		
	<ul> <li>b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	•	ducing or simplifying the issues for	
(	d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).	
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
'	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)			Э
	The purposes of appear, the proposed amendment(s), a) now the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided in the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ii be enteled and an explanation of	
	AVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
ŀ	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			Ł
•	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a	
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation EST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.	
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:	
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	STER KINCAID/ ervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that

"Larsson teaches that during the time at which the tandem of phone 100 and kit 160 are in communication with the cellular system (i.e., in a communication session with a wireless network), the phone 100 and kit are in communication with each other. Only at step 340, "after the communication is finished," that is, after the phone/kit tandem cease communicating with the cellular system, do the phone 100 and kit 160 end communication with each other."

This argument is not persuasive because the applicant is arguing the against references separately. Larsson does not disclose the above limitation and that is why another reference, Khullar, was provided. Khullar discloses the above limitation of ending communication between the mobile and embedded phone.

Applicant argues that

"Khullar fails to supply the teachings missing from Larsson, namely ending communication between a personal mobile phone and an embedded phone, and after ending the communication, opening a communication session between the embedded phone and a wireless network based on a sent confirmation."

This argument is not persuasive. Khullar was provided to meet the limitation of ending communication and Khullar meets this limitation. Khullar meets this limitation by disabling a transceiver. .